

## RESPONSE AND REMARKS

### REJECTIONS UNDER SECTION 103(a)

An Appeal Decision dated May 28, 2010 affirmed rejections under Section 103(a) of Claims 1-10 and 15-21 of the above-identified application by the Office Action dated July 27, 2007. In particular, the Appeal Decision affirmed the Claims as being unpatentable over Nicholls et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,485,369; "Nicholls") in view of Kara (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,568; "Kara") and in further view of Williams, Martyn, "Internet Update," Newsbytes, dated Feb. 18, 1998 ("InterShipper").

This Amendment and Response is timely filed with a concurrently-filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR §1.114 with the corresponding fee.

### RESPONSE REGARDING CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 103(a)

The Examiner's rejections of the Claims and the Appeal Decision have been carefully considered. Claims 1- 3, 5-10 and 15-17 have been amended to more distinctly claim the claimed invention.

The Appeal Decision and the Office Action apparently interpreted the previously claimed default shipping location as comprising an origin postal code. See, e.g., Appeal Decision, pgs. 7-8.

As distinguished from a mere origin postal code, it is respectfully submitted that the Claims of the present application have been amended to more distinctly claim that the claimed default shipping location for a user comprises both a shipping location postal code *and a shipping location type*.

The Specification of the present application explains that various exemplary embodiments of the claimed default shipping location type may comprise, by way of illustrative, non-limiting example, a shipping center, a drop box, a carrier counter, or a call for pickup. See, e.g., Specification, p. 30, lines 17-24.

The Claims of the present application claim carrier-specific consideration of both a ship-from postal code and a ship-from shipping location type in

determining whether or not a carrier would support shipping a particular parcel and/or in calculating a shipping rate. *Cf. also, e.g., Specification, p. 3, lines 18-23 and lines 24-28.*

It is respectfully asserted that none of the cited references disclose carrier-specific consideration of both a ship-from postal code and a ship-from shipping location type in determining whether or not a carrier would support shipping a particular parcel and/or in calculating a shipping rate.

For the above-given reasons and in view of the herewith-made Claim amendments, it is respectfully asserted that the Claims of the present application are not obvious in view of, and are therefore patentable over, Kara, Nicholls, and InterShipper, whether considered alone or in combination. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that the present application is in condition for allowance and it is therefore respectfully requested that the present application be reconsidered and allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

KHORSANDI PATENT LAW GROUP, ALC

By Marilyn R. Khorsandi July 26, 2010

Marilyn R. Khorsandi  
Reg. No. 45,744  
Customer No. 29524  
Khorsandi Patent Law Group,  
A Law Corporation  
140 S. Lake Ave., Ste. 312  
Pasadena, California 91101-4710  
Telephone No.: (626) 796-2856  
Facsimile: (626) 796-2864